arXiv:1208.1872v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 9 Aug 2012

Clausius inequality and optimality of quasi static transformations for nonequilibrium stationary states

L. Bertini,[1] D. Gabrielli,[2] G. Jona-Lasinio,[3] and C. Landim[4]
[1]*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Piazza A. Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy*
[2]*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università dell'Aquila, 67100 Coppito, L'Aquila, Italy*
[3]*Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Piazza A. Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy*
[4]*IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, J. Botanico, 22460 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil,*
and CNRS UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France

Nonequilibrium stationary states of thermodynamic systems dissipate a positive amount of energy per unit of time. If we consider transformations of such states that are realized by letting the driving depend on time, the amount of energy dissipated in an unbounded time window becomes then infinite. Following the general proposal by Oono and Paniconi and using results of the macroscopic fluctuation theory, we give a natural definition of a renormalized work performed along any given transformation. We then show that the renormalized work satisfies a Clausius inequality and prove that equality is achieved for very slow transformations, that is in the quasi static limit. We finally connect the renormalized work to the quasi potential of the macroscopic fluctuation theory that gives the probability of fluctuations in the stationary nonequilibrium ensemble.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.20.-y, 05.40.-a, 05.60.-k

A main goal of nonequilibrium thermodynamics is to construct analogues of thermodynamic potentials for nonequilibrium stationary states. These potentials should describe the typical macroscopic behavior of the system as well as the asymptotic probability of fluctuations. As it has been shown in [1], this program can be implemented without the explicit knowledge of the stationary ensemble and requires as input the macroscopic dynamical behavior of systems which can be characterized by the transport coefficients. This theory, now known as *macroscopic fluctuation theory*, is based on an extension of Einstein equilibrium fluctuation theory to stationary nonequilibrium states combined with a dynamical point of view. It has been very powerful in studying concrete microscopic models but can be used also as a phenomenological theory. It has led to several new interesting predictions [2–7].

In this letter we develop a theory of thermodynamic transformations for nonequilibrium stationary states in the concrete case of driven diffusive systems. We thus consider an open system in contact with boundary reservoirs and/or under the action of an external field and we analyze the situation in which the reservoirs and field vary with time driving the system from a nonequilibrium state to another one. For simplicity of notation, we restrict to the case of a single conservation law, e.g., the conservation of the mass. The system is in contact with boundary reservoirs, characterized by their chemical potential λ, and under the action of an external field E. We denote by $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the bounded region occupied by the system, by x the macroscopic space coordinates and by t the macroscopic time. With respect to our previous work [1, 3–5, 8], we consider the case in which λ and E can depend explicitly on the time t. The macroscopic dynamics is given by the hydrodynamic equation for the density which satisfies the following general assumption, based on the notion of local equilibrium. For stochastic lattice gases these assumptions can be proven rigorously and the macroscopic transport coefficient can be characterized in terms of the underlying microscopic dynamics [9].

The macroscopic state is completely described by the local density $u(t,x)$ and the associated current $j(t,x)$. In the sequel we drop the dependence on the space coordinate x from the notation. The macroscopic evolution is given by the continuity equation

$$\partial_t u(t) + \nabla \cdot j(t) = 0, \tag{1}$$

together with the constitutive equation $j(t) = J(t,u(t))$ expressing the local current in function of the local density. For driven diffusive systems the constitutive equation takes the form

$$J(t,\rho) = -D(\rho)\nabla\rho + \chi(\rho)\,E(t) \tag{2}$$

where the *diffusion coefficient* $D(\rho)$ and the *mobility* $\chi(\rho)$ are $d \times d$ positive matrices. In the case of time independent driving the right hand side does not depend explicitly on time and we denote the current simply by $J(\rho)$. The transport coefficients in (2) satisfy the local Einstein relation $D(\rho) = \chi(\rho)\, f''(\rho)$, where f is the equilibrium free energy per unit of volume. The interaction with the external reservoirs specify the boundary conditions for the evolution defined by (1)–(2). Recalling that $\lambda(t)$ is the chemical potential of the reservoirs, this boundary condition reads $f'\big(u(t,x)\big) = \lambda(t,x)$, $x \in \partial\Lambda$. We shall also assume that when λ and E do not depend on time there is a unique and globally attractive stationary solution for the flow defined by (1)–(2) that is denoted by $\bar\rho = \bar\rho_{\lambda,E}$. In particular, $\bar\rho_{\lambda,E}$ is the typical density profile in the stationary nonequilibrium state corresponding to time independent chemical potential λ and external field E.

Fix time dependent paths $\lambda(t)$ of the chemical potential and $E(t)$ of the driving field. Given a density profile ρ, denote by $(u(t), j(t))$, $t \geq 0$, the solution of (1)–(2) with initial condition ρ. Let $W_{[0,T]} = W_{[0,T]}(\lambda, E, \rho)$ be the energy exchanged between the system and the external driving in the time interval $[0, T]$, that is

$$W_{[0,T]} = \int_0^T dt \Big\{ - \int_{\partial\Lambda} d\sigma(x)\, \lambda(t)\, j(t) \cdot \hat{n} + \int_\Lambda dx\, j(t) \cdot E(t) \Big\}, \tag{3}$$

where $\hat{n}$ is the outer normal to Λ and $d\sigma$ is the surface measure on $\partial\Lambda$. The first term on the right hand side is the energy provided by the reservoirs while the second is the energy provided by the external field.

In view of the boundary conditions and the Einstein relation, by using the divergence theorem in (3), we deduce that

$$W_{[0,T]} = F(u(T)) - F(\rho) + \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda dx\, j(t) \cdot \chi(u(t))^{-1} j(t), \tag{4}$$

where F is the equilibrium free energy functional,

$$F(\rho) = \int_\Lambda dx\, f(\rho(x)). \tag{5}$$

Consider two stationary states corresponding to (time-independent) (λ_0, E_0) and (λ_1, E_1) and denote by $\bar{\rho}_0 = \bar{\rho}_{\lambda_0, E_0}$ and $\bar{\rho}_1 = \bar{\rho}_{\lambda_1, E_1}$ the associated density profiles. Such states can be either equilibrium or nonequilibrium states. We can drive the system from the initial state $\bar{\rho}_0$ at time $t = 0$ to the final state $\bar{\rho}_1$ at time $t = +\infty$ by considering a time dependent forcing $(\lambda(t), E(t))$ satisfying $(\lambda(0), E(0)) = (\lambda_0, E_0)$ and $(\lambda(+\infty), E(+\infty)) = (\lambda_1, E_1)$. As the second term on the right hand side of (4) is positive, by letting $W = W_{[0,+\infty)}$ be the total energy exchanged in the transformation, we deduce the Clausius inequality

$$W \geq \Delta F = F(\bar{\rho}_1) - F(\bar{\rho}_0). \tag{6}$$

When the initial and final states are equilibrium states, e.g., the external field E vanishes and the chemical potential λ is constant, the inequality (6) is a standard formulation of the second law of thermodynamics. Moreover, by considering a sequence of transformations in which the variation of the driving becomes very slow, it is not difficult to show that equality in (6) is achieved in the quasi static limit, we refer to [10] for the details. On the other hand, in the present situation of nonequilibrium states the inequality (6) does not carry any information. Indeed, as nonequilibrium states support a non vanishing current, in the limit $T \to +\infty$ the second term on the right hand side of (4) becomes infinite so that the left hand side of (6) is infinite while the right hand side is bounded. By interpreting the ideas in [11], further developed in [12, 13], we next define a renormalized work for a which a significant Clausius inequality can be obtained also for nonequilibrium stationary states.

To this aim, we recall the quasi potential, which is the key notion of the macroscopic fluctuation theory. Consider a system with time independent driving and let $(\hat{u}(t), \hat{\jmath}(t))$, $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ be a pair density–current satisfying the continuity equation $\partial_t \hat{u} + \nabla \cdot \hat{\jmath} = 0$. According to the basic principles of the macroscopic fluctuation theory [1, 3], the probability of observing this path is given, up to a prefactor, by

$$\exp\Big\{ - \varepsilon^{-d} \beta\, I_{[T_1,T_2]}(\hat{u}, \hat{\jmath}) \Big\} \tag{7}$$

where ε is the scaling parameter, i.e., the ratio between the microscopic length scale (say the typical intermolecular distance) and the macroscopic one, $\beta = 1/\kappa T$ (here T is the temperature), and the action functional I has the form

$$I_{[T_1,T_2]}(\hat{u}, \hat{\jmath}) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} dt \int_\Lambda dx\, \big[\hat{\jmath}(t) - J(\hat{u}(t))\big] \cdot \chi(\hat{u}(t))^{-1} \big[\hat{\jmath}(t) - J(\hat{u}(t))\big]. \tag{8}$$

In particular, if $(\hat{u}, \hat{\jmath})$ solves (1)–(2) then $I_{[T_1,T_2]}(\hat{u}, \hat{\jmath}) = 0$. The above statement therefore implies that the typical behavior of the system is described by the hydrodynamic equations. The quasi potential is the functional on the set of density profiles defined by the variational problem

$$V(\rho) = \inf \Big\{ I_{(-\infty,0]}(\hat{u}, \hat{\jmath}),\ \hat{u}(0) = \rho \Big\} \tag{9}$$

where the infimum is carried out over all the trajectories satisfying the prescribed boundary condition. Namely, $V(\rho)$ is the minimal action to bring the system from the typical density profile $\bar{\rho}$ to the fluctuation ρ. The probability of a density profile ρ in the stationary nonequilibrium ensemble is then given, up to a prefactor, by

$$\exp\Big\{ - \varepsilon^{-d} \beta\, V(\rho) \Big\}. \tag{10}$$

In particular, the minimizer of V is the typical density profile $\bar{\rho}$. For equilibrium states it can be shown [5] that V coincides, apart an affine transformation, with the free energy functional (5). Moreover, as shown in [1], the functional V solves the stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\int_\Lambda dx\, \nabla \frac{\delta V}{\delta \rho} \cdot \chi(\rho)\, \nabla \frac{\delta V}{\delta \rho} - \int_\Lambda dx\, \frac{\delta V}{\delta \rho}\, \nabla \cdot J(\rho) = 0 \tag{11}$$

where $\delta V / \delta \rho$ vanishes at the boundary $\partial\Lambda$ and ρ satisfies the boundary condition $f'(\rho(x)) = \lambda(x)$, $x \in \partial\Lambda$.

In the case of time independent driving, the current $J(\rho)$ in (2) can be decomposed as $J(\rho) = J_{\mathrm{S}}(\rho) + J_{\mathrm{A}}(\rho)$, where

$$J_{\mathrm{S}}(\rho) = -\chi(\rho)\, \nabla \frac{\delta V}{\delta \rho} \tag{12}$$

and $J_{\mathrm{A}}(\rho) = J(\rho) - J_{\mathrm{S}}(\rho)$. In view of the stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (11), the above decomposition is orthogonal in the sense that for each density profile ρ

$$\int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{S}}(\rho) \cdot \chi(\rho)^{-1} J_{\mathrm{A}}(\rho) = 0. \tag{13}$$

We shall refer to $J_{\mathrm{S}}(\rho)$ as the *symmetric* current and to $J_{\mathrm{A}}(\rho)$ as the *antisymmetric* current. This terminology refers to symmetric and antisymmetric part of the microscopic dynamics [1, 3, 14]. We remark that J_{S} is proportional to the thermodynamic force and the above decomposition depends on the external driving.

Since the quasi potential V is minimal in the stationary profile, we deduce that $J_{\mathrm{S}}(\bar\rho) = 0$; namely, the stationary current is purely antisymmetric. In particular, $J_{\mathrm{A}}(\bar\rho)$ is the typical current in the stationary nonequilibrium ensemble associated and it is therefore experimentally accessible. In view of the general formula (4) for the total work, the amount of energy per unit of time needed to maintain the system in the stationary profile $\bar\rho$ is

$$\int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{A}}(\bar\rho) \cdot \chi(\bar\rho)^{-1} J_{\mathrm{A}}(\bar\rho). \tag{14}$$

We shall next consider time dependent driving and define a renormalized work by subtracting to the total work exchanged between the driving and the system the energy needed to maintain the stationary state. Fix, therefore, $T > 0$, a density profile ρ, and space-time dependent chemical potentials $\lambda(t)$ and external field $E(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, and let $(u(t), j(t))$, be the corresponding solution of (1)–(2) with initial condition ρ. Recalling (14), we define the renormalized work $W^{\mathrm{ren}}_{[0,T]} = W^{\mathrm{ren}}_{[0,T]}(\lambda, E, \rho)$ performed by the reservoirs and the external field in the time interval $[0, T]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\mathrm{ren}}_{[0,T]} &= W_{[0,T]} \\ &- \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{A}}(t, u(t))\ \cdot \chi(u(t))^{-1} J_{\mathrm{A}}(t, u(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In this formula $W_{[0,T]} = W_{[0,T]}(\lambda, E, \rho)$ is given in (3),

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, \rho) &= J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, \rho) + J_{\mathrm{A}}(t, \rho), \\ J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, \rho) &= -\chi(\rho)\, \nabla \frac{\delta V_{\lambda(t),E(t)}(\rho)}{\delta \rho} \end{aligned}$$

in which $J(t, \rho)$ is given by (2) and $V_{\lambda(t),E(t)}$ is the quasi potential relative to the state $\lambda(t), E(t)$ with frozen t. Observe that the definition of the renormalized work involves the antisymmetric current $J_{\mathrm{A}}(t)$ computed not at density profile $\bar\rho_{\lambda(t),E(t)}$ but at the solution $u(t)$ of the time dependent hydrodynamic equation. That is, at time t we subtract the power the system would dissipate if its actual state $u(t)$ were a stationary state. This choice, which is certainly reasonable for slow transformations, leads to a Clausius inequality. Indeed, by using (4) and the orthogonality between the symmetric and the antisymmetric part of the current,

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\mathrm{ren}}_{[0,T]}(\lambda, E, \rho) &= F(u(T)) - F(\rho) \\ &+ \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)) \cdot \chi(u(t))^{-1} J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Consider a density profile ρ and a space-time dependent chemical potential and external field $(\lambda(t), E(t))$, $t \geq 0$, converging to (λ_1, E_1) as $t \to +\infty$. Let $\bar\rho_1 = \bar\rho_{\lambda_1,E_1}$ be the stationary profile associated to (λ_1, E_1) and $(u(t), j(t))$, $t \geq 0$, be the solution of (1)–(2) with initial condition ρ. Since $u(T)$ converges to $\bar\rho_1$, the symmetric part of the current, $J_{\mathrm{S}}(u(T))$, relaxes as $T \to +\infty$ to $J_{\mathrm{S}}(\bar\rho_1) = 0$. Under suitable assumptions on the transformation, the last integral in the previous formula is convergent as $T \to +\infty$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\mathrm{ren}}(\lambda, E, \rho) &= F(\bar\rho_1) - F(\rho) \\ &+ \int_0^\infty dt \int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)) \cdot \chi(u(t))^{-1} J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where F is the equilibrium free energy functional (5). In particular,

$$W^{\mathrm{ren}}(\lambda, E, \rho) \geq F(\bar\rho_1) - F(\rho), \tag{17}$$

which is a meaningful version of the Clausius inequality for nonequilibrium states. Indeed, by considering a sequence of transformations $(\lambda(t), E(t))$ which vary on a time scale $1/\delta$, we realize that the integrand on second term in the right hand side of (16) is of order δ^2 while the integral essentially extends, due to the finite relaxation time of the system, over an interval of order δ^{-1}. Therefore in quasi static limit $\delta \to 0$ equality in (17) is achieved. We refer to [10] for more details.

For special transformations, the integral in (16), which represents the *excess work* over a quasi static transformations, can be related to the quasi potential. Consider at time $t = 0$ a stationary nonequilibrium profile $\bar\rho_0$ corresponding to some driving (λ_0, E_0). The system is put in contact with new reservoirs at chemical potential λ_1 and a new external field E_1. For $t > 0$ the system evolves according to the hydrodynamic equation (1)–(2) with initial condition $\bar\rho_0$, time independent boundary condition λ_1 and external field E_1. In particular, as $t \to +\infty$ the system relaxes to $\bar\rho_1$, the stationary density profile corresponding to (λ_1, E_1). A simple calculation shows that along such a path

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty dt \int_\Lambda dx\ J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)) \cdot \chi(u(t))^{-1} J_{\mathrm{S}}(t, u(t)) \\ &\qquad = V_{\lambda_1,E_1}(\bar\rho_0) - V_{\lambda_1,E_1}(\bar\rho_1) = V_{\lambda_1,E_1}(\bar\rho_0). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

This relationship shows that the quasi potential represents the extra work necessary to reach the initial state from the final stationary state or the maximal useful work obtainable from the relaxation process. In equilibrium thermodynamics this quantity is known as *availability* [15]. Therefore, while a definition of thermodynamic potentials, that is functionals of the state of the system, does not appear possible in nonequilibrium thermodynamics, the quasi potential is the natural extension of the availability which is instead a function of the state of the system and of the environment. We refer to [10] for an interesting connection of the quasi potential with the *relative entropy* between nonequilibrium states.

The definition of renormalized work we have introduced is natural within our approach and insures, as we have discussed, both its finiteness and the validity of Clausius inequality. It is however not simple to obtain as it requires the preliminary calculation of the quasi-potential, a generically nonlocal quantity. One may ask whether there exist other simpler ways of renormalizing in particular by subtracting a local counter term. To be concrete let us consider again the relaxation process of the previous paragraph and subtract from the total work the energy dissipated as if the system were during the whole process in the final stationary state. That is in the integral in equation (15) we replace $u(t)$ with $\bar{\rho}_1$. Now everything is local. However, even if one could prove that a finite quantity is obtained in the limit $T \to +\infty$, there is no Clausius inequality. In fact, as discussed long ago in [16], a stationary state is not in general a state of minimal entropy production.

In the recent work [17], Maes and Netocny considered the topic of a nonequilibrium renormalized Clausius inequality in the context of a single Brownian particle in a time dependent environment. In this setting, by introducing a potential field such that the corresponding stationary state has minimal entropy production, they propose a notion of "renormalized heat" which satisfies the Clausius inequality. To compare the approach in [17] to the present one, we can consider N independent particles in the hydrodynamic scaling limit $N \to \infty$. We then obtain a thermodynamic system for which the scheme discussed here can be applied. The two notions of renormalization are different. It is not clear to us how the approach in [17] can be generalized to cover the case of interacting particles in the hydrodynamic scaling limit.

We are in debt to J. Lebowitz for permanent discussions on the topics here considered. We also acknowledge stimulating exchange of views with C. Di Castro, T. Komatsu, N. Nakagawa, S. Sasa, and H. Tasaki.

[1] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Statist. Phys. **110**, 635–675 (2002).

[2] C. Appert-Rolland, B. Derrida, V. Lecomte, F. van Wijland; Phys. Rev. E **78**, 021122 (2008).

[3] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Statist. Phys. **123**, 237-276 (2006).

[4] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. L11001 (2010).

[5] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. P07014 (2007).

[6] T. Bodineau, B. Derrida; Phys. Rev. E **72** 066110 (2005).

[7] B. Derrida; J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. **7**, P07023 (2007).

[8] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Statist. Phys. **123**, 857-872 (2009).

[9] H. Spohn; *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles.* Springer, Berlin, 1991.

[10] L. Bertini, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; *Thermodynamic transformations of nonequilibrium states.* Preprint 2012, `arXiv:1206.2412v1`

[11] Y. Oono, M. Paniconi; Dynamic organization of fluctuations (Nishinomiya, 1997). Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. **130**, 29 (1998).

[12] T. Hatano, S. Sasa; Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3463 (2001).

[13] T. Komatsu, N. Nakagawa, S. Sasa, H. Tasaki; J. Stat. Phys. **142**, 127 (2011).

[14] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim; J. Statist. Phys. **116**, 831-841 (2004).

[15] A.B. Pippard; *Elements of classical thermodynamics for advanced students of physics.* Cambridge University Press, New York 1957.

[16] G. Eyink, J.L. Lebowitz, H. Spohn; Microscopic Origin of Hydrodynamic Behavior: Entropy Production and the Steady State. "CHAOS/XAOC" Soviet-American Perspectives on Nonlinear Science, David K. Campbell, editor. 1990.

[17] C. Maes, K. Netocny; *A nonequilibrium extension of the Clausius heat theorem.* Preprint 2012, `arXiv:1206.3423v1`